

**MINUTES**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
Nave, Community Design Studio  
7506 East Indian School Road  
October 13, 2005  
5:00 p.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Wimmer called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Present:** Ed Wimmer, Chairman  
George Hartz, Vice-Chairman  
Kathy Howard  
Lisa Loss

**Absent:** Nancy Dallett  
Dezbah Hatathli  
Paul Winslow

**Staff:** Debbie Abele  
Don Meserve  
Don Hadder, Sr.

**Also Present:** Joe Berria  
Marilyn Berria  
James Kellar  
Katryn James  
Carole Frere  
Jim Grube  
Dan Hadden

**1. INTRODUCTIONS AND ROLL CALL/ MINUTES**

The presence of Commissioners as shown above was noted.

Commissioner Howard noted a correction on page 3 of the minutes of the September 8, 2005 meeting. In the second paragraph, which begins: "Commissioner Howard reported having..." the phrase: "August 2005 report of the Board of Trustees" should be deleted and in its place "Vision 2010" should be substituted.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE AMENDED MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2005 MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LOSS AND CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 4 (FOUR) TO 0 (ZERO).**

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

Ms. Abele asked the Commission to consider the Taliesin matter after the public hearing matters on certificates have been heard.

### **3. 6702 E. Palm Lane Certificate of Appropriateness, Case 3-HP-2004**

Ms. Abele noted that this is the first in a series of reviews the Commission will undertake relating to certificates of appropriateness. Procedures and processes are still being implemented. Draft Preservation Guidelines for Village Grove 1-6 were included in the Commissioner's packets for their use in reviewing the three certificates.

Ms. Abele presented the staff report. This is a small addition to an existing home and the ridgeline is below the existing roofline. In the initial application, the Applicants were planning to use stucco. They now plan to use block. The windows on the addition are unlike those on the existing home; however, the existing windows will remain in place and the new windows will not be visible from the street. This project is in conformance with the guidelines and staff recommends approval.

Ms. James, the architect and applicant for 3-HP-2005, addressed the Commission. In answer to a question from Chairman Wimmer, she stated that she was recommending the use of blocks that match the dimensions of the existing blocks.

Vice-Chairman Hartz asked what the phrase "limited visibility" meant. Ms. Abele explained that there is a pattern of windows that are seen from the street. These windows do not form part of that pattern, nor do they disrupt that pattern.

Mr. Meserve noted that the owner, Mr. Kellar, is also present at the meeting.

**COMMISSIONER LOSS MADE A MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 3-HP-2004, BASED ON ITEMS 1 THROUGH 7 OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER HOWARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF 4 (FOUR) TO 0 (ZERO).**

Chairman Wimmer noted that this was the very first application in the City's history to go through this process. Mr. Kellar, the property owner addressed the meeting. He assured the Commission that the windows are not visible from the street and thanked the Commission.

Ms. Abele explained that plans will be stored in the case files in preservation if applicants make changes. The Certificate of Appropriateness also will have a notation of the change in material from stucco to block for Case 3-HP-2005. The entire record goes with the application for a building permit. Ms. Abele informed Ms. James that the signed Certificate of Appropriateness would be available for pickup the following day.

Ms. Frere, who lives next door to the Applicant's property, noted that another house on the street was built with three bedrooms and expressed support for the planned addition.

### **4. 6701 E. Cypress Street Certificate of Appropriateness, Case 4-HP-2005**

Ms. Abele presented the staff report, noting that this is a proposed carport enclosure and rear addition to an existing single-family residence. Board and batten will be used in both areas of the project. The carport enclosure will be built within the existing area of the carport, so there is no disruption to the

form of the house. The backyard addition is to be lower than the roofline of the existing home. Staff considers the form, materials and features in the proposed project appropriate for what is found in homes in the neighborhood and recommend approval.

Mr. Grube, the Applicant's designer and general contractor, addressed the Commission, noting that his company, Westcor Remodeling has a commitment to preservation. He explained that the carport would appear to be original. The addition in the rear will be behind a 6 and 1/2 foot high block fence and will not be visible from the street.

In response to a question by Chairman Wimmer regarding the appearance of the garage door, Mr. Grube stated that it will be a five-section door without windows; antique style, including a frame.

Chairman Wimmer noted that there was no public comment and closed public testimony.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN HARTZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 4-HP-2005 AS SUBMITTED, RECOGNIZING THE ADHERENCE TO THE DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES IN THE KEY COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT AS LISTED ON PAGE 3 OF THE STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER LOSS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF 4 (FOUR) TO 0 (ZERO).**

## **5. 6707 E. Hubbell Street**

Ms. Abele noted that the Applicant had not yet arrived. Mr. Meserve reported that the Applicant had informed staff that he would be late.

### **2. Initiate Historic Property (HP) Overlay Zoning for approximately 10-2/3 acres of Taliesin West for the Boundary Recommended by the Taliesin West HP Designation Committee.**

Ms. Abele presented the committee recommendation for an HP boundary. She reminded the Commissioners that they had approved the boundaries at the previous meeting and noted that the next step is to officially initiate the zoning overlay process. The merits of the case will be the subject of a public hearing and will not be discussed at this meeting.

Ms. Abele reported that City surveyors had been out to review the boundaries that the Commission had agreed upon. A legal description has been prepared, which the Frank Lloyd Wright (FLW) Foundation has had an opportunity to review. A representative from the FLW Foundation was not available to attend the Commission meeting due to a conflict with an out-of-state event. The FLW Foundation is aware that discussion would not be taking place.

Vice-Chairman Hartz asked if the Commission could discuss correspondence that had ensued since the last meeting. Ms. Abele noted that is acceptable to discuss procedures and the owner's response to the proposed boundary. Vice-Chairman Hartz queried whether Chairman Wimmer and Commissioner Dallett were satisfied with the correspondence. Chairman Wimmer indicated that he is comfortable with the content of the letter to Commissioner Dallett from Vern Swaback, Chairman of the Board.

Commissioner Howard stated that as a professional historian she wanted to voice her strong concerns regarding the HP proposal. Of Taliesin's 491 acres, only 10-2/3 acres fall within the proposed HP boundary. This means only 2.17 percent of the site will be considered for designation. Her issue relates to the land surrounding the 10-2/3 acres. Without preserving its viewsheds, the sense of place, and how Taliesin relates to its surroundings, a hallmark of Wright's architectural triumphs is at risk.

Frank Lloyd Wright's vision in selecting the site, placement and design of the Taliesin buildings, on the brow of the mountain range as it sweeps down toward the Salt River, could be lost forever. From Taliesin, one sees the front wall of the Superstition Mountains and the summit of Weaver's Needle peeking out from behind it, Red Mountain, Verde Peak, the San Tans, Papago Buttes, South Mountain, the Estrella Ranges, and the icon of the Valley, Camelback Mountain. These are all elements in Wright's panoramic mural of the Sonoran Desert. Much of the land seen from Taliesin is important to contemporary history and is also sacred to the Akimel Au-Authm (Pima) and Xalychidom Pipaash (Maricopa) neighbors who live to the south. Views of Valley high points are integral to this site and without preservation of viewsheds, Taliesin's meaning and sense of place is lost.

Commissioner Howard requested that fellow Commissioners consider the implications of the decision to be made. She further explained that at the Taliesin subcommittee meeting on September 7, 2005, Mr. Swaback, CEO of Taliesin and Mr. Berry, the attorney representing Taliesin, prominently placed on the table before the Commission, a white three-inch binder entitled: "Vision 2010." They indicated plans were under way for improvements to Taliesin. Commissioner Howard noted that she later realized that by introducing Vision 2010 in that way, Mr. Swaback implied that the binder and its contents were supporting evidence that the FLW Foundation had already produced development plans for Taliesin West. No one on the Commission is privy to the plan, which has a major bearing on the preservation of Wright's design, the essence of the history the Commission is seeking to preserve with this HP boundary.

Commissioner Howard further reported that the day after the committee meeting she contacted Mr. Swaback and they had a lengthy telephone conversation regarding the five-year plan. She asked to review the contents of the binder. Mr. Swaback indicated that since the FLW Foundation Board had not yet approved the plan, (they were to meet on September 19) the contents were not final and therefore were confidential. He did mention plans for a conference center, a facility that usually includes meeting rooms and hotel-like accommodations. Commissioner Howard expressed great concerns about what this means.

Commissioner Howard continued to report, noting that she phoned Mr. Swaback twice, after September 19 and he has not returned her calls. She stated that she has specific questions that bear on the viability of any Taliesin historic preservation proposal and representatives of Taliesin have not provided any information regarding their future development plans.

Commissioner Howard expressed disappointment that Mr. Swaback and Mr. Berry were not in attendance. She would like more specific information about Taliesin's development. She asked: Will Mr. Wright's statement that a building "should not be on a hill, but of a hill" be honored? How can the Commission approve something where they have been denied insight into its future? She noted that in other historic preservation designations, the Commission has sought to preserve the integrity of early Scottsdale life.

Commissioner Howard wondered why the Commission was avoiding discussion of the future plans and whether the Commission was doing its job if it approved something with so many unknowns. By moving this historic preservation proposal to designate the site, acquiescing to Special Campus (SC) status, a mechanism that streamlines approval of new development efforts, the Commission was leaving the door open for unspecified changes to one of Scottsdale's authentic historic attractions.

In closing, Commissioner Howard presented the following questions: What is the Commission doing to protect viewsheds from the site? What is the value of saving a bunch of buildings and losing their soul as part of the surrounding desert? What good is HP designation if the essence of the history the Commission is seeking to preserve is obliterated by adjacent new developments?

Chairman Wimmer thanked Commissioner Howard for her prepared remarks, noting that her points were well stated and came from the heart.

In response to questions from Chairman Wimmer, Ms. Abele confirmed that the matter before the Commission at this point is the initiation of the process and that final designation would occur after a public hearing. Commissioners would then have the opportunity to ask the questions that Commissioner Howard so eloquently expressed.

Ms. Abele added that at the public hearing, however, the questions before the Commission are: Does it meet the criteria? Is it significant? Questions about the future of Taliesin West are not germane to designation. The proposed boundaries could be discussed at the public hearing. At the end of the hearing, a succinct statement is needed for the record as to why it meets or does not meet the criteria, or on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the proposed boundaries.

Chairman Wimmer noted that Commissioner Howard's concerns are that the proposed boundary is not large enough. Ms. Abele stated that that is germane to this discussion on initiation. Chairman Wimmer remarked that concerns regarding protection of the land are a boundary issue. Ms. Abele noted that a discussion of the features and physical characteristics of the property is relevant. There should be a discussion and a record built regarding those issues. Speculation about the future cannot figure into the discussion at the designation hearing. Ms. Abele informed the Commission that the boundaries, once initiated, cannot be expanded via a hearing. The process would have to be re-initiated if the Commission decided at the public hearing that the boundaries were too small.

Chairman Wimmer sensed that Commissioner Howard is looking for comfort that this boundary is sufficient to truly preserve the essence of Taliesin. Commissioner Howard confirmed her concerns are that it could all be lost. Ms. Abele explained that there are only minimal protections that come with HP overlay zoning. There is a one-year stay of demolition. New development cannot be prevented if the zoning allows it. The HP overlay zone does not provide ultimate protection.

Ms. Abele noted that one comment made during the previous meeting was that stronger protections may be possible through the Special Campus rezoning process. Chairman Wimmer remarked that it is troubling to think that everything could legally be demolished on a designated property after waiting a year.

Vice Chairman Hartz asked whether there are any specific dates in the agreement between the September 2003 between the City and the FLW Foundation that necessitate initiation now. Ms. Abele stated that if the Historic Preservation Commission had not formally begun the process within a two-year period, the City could look remiss in that it had not moved forward and had allowed too much time to pass. The decision to move forward is in order to be in compliance with the two-year old agreement that the City and the FLW Foundation follow-through with the agreed upon HP designation for Taliesin West.

Ms. Abele also noted the timing issues related to the Commission approved work program for 2005 that lists the Taliesin West designation to be completed by the end of 2005. Open houses, proposed for November 3rd and November 10th, are required to be held before the first public hearing on the HP overlay zoning. If the Commission acts tonight, the matter could go before the Planning Commission by December 14th and before City Council on January 10, 2006 for action.

Ms. Abele reminded Commissioners of the FLW Foundation's interest in their Special Campus zoning request and the HP overlay zoning occurring concurrently. Staff is concerned about such a process,

which could be confusing to neighbors. Ms. Abele recalled that in the letter of agreement with the Frank Lloyd Wright (FLW) Foundation, the Commission said the HP overlay zoning would be in place first and the FLW Foundation was given notice that at the end of the two-year period, if the Special Campus zoning was not approved, the Commission would revisit the boundary question. At that time, boundaries could be reconsidered.

Ms. Abele added that there had been discussion at the previous meeting that even if the entire site were to be designated HP overlay, the Historic Preservation Commission would not necessarily be the review body for approving any proposed development on the site. The review process for new construction could occur through a Development Review Board (DRB) hearing, with Historic Preservation Commission input.

Mr. Meserve would act on behalf of the Commission as the Applicant in a City-initiated case, should the Commission approve an action to start a process for HP overlay zoning. When completing the paperwork, he would state that, unlike some other zoning cases, there is no project, proposed development or change in land use. He stressed the importance of the Commission's understanding that the act of proposing or approving HP overlay zoning does nothing to change permitted land uses, existing buildings, traffic or anything else.

Mr. Meserve further noted that the FLW Foundation has expressed an interest in changing their underlying zoning to Special Campus through a rezoning application. Mr. Don Hadder has been selected by Current Planning to be the FLW Foundation's staff contact and coordinator for their Special Campus district.

A discussion ensued regarding the significance and impacts of HP overlay zoning. In response to a question by Chairman Wimmer, Ms. Abele confirmed that allowing the process to get bogged down in lengthy discussions at this point would, in fact, prolong the risk that things could be changed without the Commission being involved. Ms. Abele explained that if the process were to be initiated at the current meeting, January 10, 2006 is the earliest date that the land could be designated HP by City Council. There would then be a subsequent 30-day waiting period before the HP overlay zoning went into effect.

In response to query by Chairman Wimmer regarding the difference in the boundary shown on the proposal and the National Register boundary, Mr. Meserve explained that the National Landmark and the National Register designations both cover larger areas. Mr. Meserve noted that those designations have very little to do with what the City of Scottsdale decides to do with local designation because the City has very little ability to influence what can happen at Taliesin West as a result of national recognition.

Chairman Wimmer remarked that, notwithstanding Commissioner Howard's eloquence, he would entertain a motion to proceed with the HP initiation for Taliesin West, on the basis that proceeding keeps the ball rolling and does not bog the Commission down at a point where it would appear that there is more advantage to engaging the FLW Foundation through the HP designation process. At the end of that process, if the Commission feels that the boundary is not large enough, they could then re-initiate a case and the Commission would at least have exercised the requirement that the City be taking action on this matter.

Upon hearing none, Chairman Wimmer noted that the Commission was not ready for a vote and directed staff to place this matter on the agenda of the next meeting, since it appears that the Commission needs to discuss the initiation further before taking action.

Vice Chairman Hartz opined that it was particularly appropriate that a motion was not made, given the absence of Commissioner Dallett, the Chairperson of the Taliesin West HP Designation Committee. The points raised by Commissioner Howard are worthy of serious consideration.

For the record, Chairman Wimmer regretted that the present meeting occurred on a religious holiday and not all Commissioners were in attendance.

**5. 6707 E. Hubbell Street Certificate of Appropriateness, Case 5-HP-2004**

Ms. Abele presented the staff report, noting that this application is a request for approval of replacement windows for an existing single-family residence in the Village Grove Historic District. The windows are on the primary façade facing Hubbell Street and other facades. The Applicant wants to replace the windows with more energy-efficient Pella windows. These will be custom-made in an effort to maintain the same openings. The Applicant wants to divide the lights by using an interior grill system sandwiched between two panes of glass. Staff appreciates the Applicant's care in maintaining the original openings. Staff recommends, however, that instead of using an interior grill that has no profile and actually introduces yet another pattern that is not found in the neighborhood, that the Applicant replace the windows with energy-efficient double-glazed windows with no divided lights to keep the lines simple.

Commissioner Loss asked Mr. Hadden, the owner and applicant, if the energy-efficient windows are available in something similar to the original windows. Mr. Hadden replied that they are custom-made and he had not checked to see if he could replicate the existing pattern with the interior grille. He does not like plate glass. He believes the windows could be built with between the panes grilles to match the pattern of the muntins in the original panes. Commissioner Loss expressed the desire to have the window patterns mimic what is original to the house.

Chairman Wimmer asked for clarification about a photo included in the application. The applicant confirmed the photo was of his house outside of the Historic District. Mr. Meserve informed the Commission that he had included the photo in the packet to show the Commissioner what the proposed replacement windows would look like with the interior grille pattern.

Chairman Wimmer asked the Applicant if it were possible to have Pella provide energy-efficient glass in a system that matched the picture window in the upper photograph. He added that the picture window has a visual identity with houses of that period. He did not want to place a roadblock in the applicant's plans but asked that he consider the recommendation for using different grilles as an alternate option. Commissioner Howard agreed with Chairman Wimmer's remarks.

Chairman Wimmer noted no public comment on the application and closed the public hearing.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE REPLACEMENT WINDOWS BE IN THE SAME PATTERN AND FORM AS THE STEEL SASH WINDOWS ON THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE. THE HORIZONTAL MUNTINS (GRILLES) COULD BE BETWEEN THE PANES OF GLASS. COMMISSIONER LOSS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF 4 (FOUR) TO 0 (ZERO).**

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

**7. Discussion: Preservation Guidelines and Character-Defining Features for Neighborhood Historic Districts**

Ms. Abele reported that staff has been working on incorporating the comments from the Commission's last review into the guidelines. This is the first round of a draft report. Staff needs to add some sections and will continue their work.

Mr. Meserve suggested that the meeting take a short break. Chairman Wimmer declared a five-minute recess.

Ms. Abele requested that the Commission review the progress made to date, noting that staff's goal is to have the guidelines approved for both neighborhoods by the end of 2005. She suggested taking the fourth Thursday on October 27th, which is reserved on the calendar, to review the guidelines. The review would focus on substance rather than format.

Chairman Wimmer expressed his hope that the guidelines would last beyond the involvement of the current Commission members. He clarified with Ms. Abele that the Commission should accept the document for review. He agreed that meeting on the fourth Thursday of the month would be a good idea. Vice-Chairman Hartz noted that he is unable to attend on October 27th. Chairman Wimmer requested that Vice-Chairman Hartz communicate any major issues he has with the draft to staff prior to the meeting.

Ms. Abele proposed that during the work session Commissioners could look at codifying guidelines and get some consensus within the Commission about how the decisions will be made using the guidelines.

Chairman Wimmer opined that the hearing on certificates went well and thanked Mr. Meserve for the work he had done ahead of time with the applicants on their plans.

Vice-Chairman Hartz queried the possibility of his listening to a recording of the October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. Reporter Robert Rioux indicated that he would look into the request and noted that a verbatim transcript could be produced, upon request. Mr. Hartz prefers an audio recording.

## **8. Report/Discussion: Formation of Historic Residential Rehabilitation Committee**

Ms. Abele reported that plans for a new committee have moved forward since the last meeting. Commissioner Winslow, who is an architect, will be the Chairman. Commissioner Loss will serve as a real estate professional. Jeff McCall, who is an architect working in Scottsdale and has been on panels with the City of Phoenix program, will be a Committee member. Joy Rich, a Village Grove resident, will serve as a neighborhood representative. Ms. Rich is the Planning Director for Maricopa County and previously worked to set up the City of Phoenix program. Former Commissioner Janie Ellis, who has an in-depth understanding of construction, has been invited to join the committee.

The first Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at 8:00 a.m. The goal is for the Committee to report back to the Commission at the November meeting. The guidelines for rehab grants could be printed in early December. Applications for grants would be due at the end of January 2006. This timetable will enable the Commission and City Council to award grants to owners in historic districts within the current budget year.

In response to questions from Commissioners Howard and Loss, Ms. Abele noted that she expects an average of one application a month for Certificates of Appropriateness. Staff is trying to simplify the paperwork, and will always place the applications into the packets mailed to Commissioners before the hearings. Mr. Meserve noted that future staff reports will be shorter when the guidelines are



finalized. Ms. Abele encouraged Commissioners to drive by the properties on their own before the hearings to get a better sense than the photos and plans in the packets can convey.

## **9. Report/ Discussion: Historic District Street Signs**

Ms. Abele reported that the creation of historic district street signs is moving forward. The City's graphic designer, Rick Forgas was enthusiastic about designing 1950s style signs. Technical specifications and costs are currently being studied. Staff has researched authentic period typefaces and may use a different accent color for each district, and a different typeface for 1960s neighborhoods.

Chairman Wimmer noted the importance of having the signs identify "Scottsdale historic neighborhood." Visitors to the Valley do not always know which city they are in.

Ms. Abele reported that staff is considering the format and timing of the unveiling ceremonies, which the Mayor will be asked to attend. Chairman Wimmer thanked Ms. Abele and asked for an updated report on signs at the next meeting.

## **10. Committee Reports/Meeting Schedules Discussion**

### **a. Community Outreach Committee**

Vice-Chairman Hartz noted that the archeology program of October 5, 2005 at the Civic center Library was an artistic success, although attendance was a little disappointing; about thirty people. He complimented the speakers, each of whom did an outstanding job. Len Marcus's presentation was terrific. Tom Wright, under the circumstances, gave a particularly good presentation. Commissioner Hatathli gave a very interesting presentation. Carla's presentation was great. Vice-Chairman Hartz also thanked Cathy Johnson, archaeologist and past Commissioner for her work in organizing and recruiting Mr. Wright. The event was a success to the extent that they had showed a small group the breadth and importance of the historic preservation work occurring in Scottsdale.

Summing up, Vice-Chairman Hartz reported that more people than were expected participated in the walking tour earlier in the year, and less than expected appeared for the archeology program. Mustang Library had been the preferred location but it was unavailable.

### **b. Historic Register Committee**

Commissioner Howard reported that the Historic Register Committee has not met and she therefore had nothing new to report. She added that the archeology program was wonderful.

## **11. Report/Discussion: HPO/Staff Report and Announcements**

Ms. Abele is trying to set up a meeting with Fred Unger. Vice-Chairman Hartz stated his interest in being able to attend that meeting.

Mr. Meserve reported that work is underway at Our Lady of Perpetual Help. A photograph that shows the original front doors has been located. The architect is now working with the Parish Committee on the door design to replicate the original doors. The revised door design could be staff approved.

John Little of the downtown group asked Mr. Meserve to advise the Commission that the Rose Garden will be moved from Fifth Avenue to another downtown location. The preferred location is next to

Scottsdale Grammar School #2, Loloma School. If structures such as trellises are part of the landscaping, and they impact any guidelines in the approved HP Plan, the Commission might be involved. Staff will review the plans for the Rose Garden when they are submitted and will decide on an appropriate review process.

**12. Commissioner Comments and Announcements**

Chairman Wimmer confirmed that all of the Commissioners had received the City memorandum regarding e-mails and the Open Meeting law.

Ms. Abele opined that tonight's hearing had gone well and that the deliberations will benefit the program.

**13. Public Comments**

None.

**14. Future Meetings and Agenda Items**

Chairman Wimmer requested that staff work with Planning Commission staff on the November joint meeting and to keep him informed. He requested that all Commissioners attend a joint meeting and asked when Commissioners will be unavailable for meetings.

Commissioner Howard advised that she will be unavailable November 3rd through the 7th as well as November 9th through the 24th.

Mr. Meserve noted that the Planning Commission has their regularly scheduled meeting on November 30th. He added that in January, the Planning Commission would have a new Chairman since Dave Gulino has served two terms and is not eligible for reappointment.

Chairman Wimmer noted that he is unavailable to attend on November 30.

**15. Adjournment**

There being no other business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
AV-Tronics, Inc.